Volume I
1959

THE MIZAN NEWSLETTER

No.1 January 1959

The Mizan Newsletter aims at giving an objective and balanced account of current Soviet writings on the Middle East.

SOVIET IDEAL AND IRAQI REALITY

Does the Iraqi revolution accord with Soviet ideals? Soviet writings on Iraq have for long made much of the "national liberation movement" in that country. Now that revolution has come to Iraq, and now that a revolutionary Government has made known a number of objectives which it has set itself, it is perhaps of some interest to compare the earlier Soviet ideal with the present Iraqi reality: to see how far the new Government, in its coming to power, its composition and its aims, has conformed to what Soviet dogmaticians had been presenting as the political ideals of the Iraqi masses.

The Soviet view of revolution as the ultimate aspiration of the working masses in non-socialist countries was gradually modified in the years from 1953 onwards. The XXth Soviet Communist Party Congress in 1956 pointed to eastern and Middle Eastern countries as examples of the attainment of independence by "bourgeois nationalist" parties using political - that is, non-revolutionary - methods.

Acting on the directives of the Party Congress, which were particularly brought to the notice of Soviet orientalists, Soviet writers on Iraq began to adopt a more favourable attitude towards Iraqi "bourgeois nationalist" parties. However, the new approval of "political" methods did not lead them to envisage any reform of Iraqi society by existing constitutional means. In THE NATIONAL LIBERATION RISING OF 1920 IN IRAQ, which went to press early in 1958, L.N. Kotlov

E

speaks with disapproval of the "bourgeois-reformist attitude" of Iraqi writers and historians who "think it possible to bring about a reconstitution of Iraqi society by means of reforms". But was revolution, in Soviet eyes, the preferred alternative to reforms? If it was, Soviet writers never acknowledged it, however much they praised risings, riots and demonstrations against the established order in Iraq.

Soviet writers' disapproval of Nuri as-Sa'id's regime was unqualified. The character and aims of this regime, and above all its foreign policy, ran counter to fundamental Soviet preconceptions. The Iraqi monarchy itself - unlike other Middle East monarchies - was sometimes referred to by Soviet writers with contempt, as British in origin and reactionary in tendency; one writer called it "the incarnation of feudal landlord and big bourgeois reaction". Political power was in the hands of "the feudalists, the tribal shaykhs and the big bourgeoisie"; their entrenched resistance to workers' and peasants' movements in defence of their rights had culminated in "police terror", with the imprisonment of patriots and Communists. Economically the country was depicted as "an agricultural and raw materials appendage of Britain, a market for its goods and a sphere for capital investment by British monopolies." But in its foreign relations above all the Iraqi regime had taken a course which, in Soviet eyes, was diametrically opposed to the interests of the Iraqi people and represented a threat to peace and to the Soviet Union itself: by joining the Baghdad Pact, Iraq had become one of the bloc of "aggressive countries" headed by the USA. It would therefore have been difficult, at the least, for Soviet thinkers to have envisaged Iraq as advancing towards independence while still preserving its existing regime. In Soviet writings it had been, and remained despite all reappraisals, a prototype of the "pseudo-independent" country controlled by foreign imperialist powers.

Iraqi "bourgeois" parties had come to be regarded as genuinely patriotic. In Soviet writings on Iraq, the new attitude emerging from the XXth Party Congress was shown rather in the closer attention which the Soviet experts gave to the study of the Iraqi opposition and its constituent elements. In 1953 the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia was still able to speak with disfavour of Iraqi "nationalist reaction", and to call the Istiqlal Party a "semi-fascist

party", which put forward "demagogic demands designed to deceive the working masses". But a work published in 1957, THE ARABS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE, spoke of the Istiqlal Party as a party which, together with the National Democratic Party, worked for the people's national objectives. The same work, in a chapter on "The Disposition of Class Forces in the National Liberation Movement in Iraq", first dwelt on the influence of the illegal Iraqi Communist Party among peasants, workers, youth and students, but went on to speak of the participation of the national bourgeoisie "and liberal landowners" in the movement for "national liberation". Different parties and different elements of the population, it was emphasized, were united in demanding the severance of Iraq's treaty connections with Britain, the development of the economy in the interests of the people, and "the democratization of the internal life of the country".

The new Iraqi Government's programme is uncritically eulogized by Soviet writers. In an article entitled "The Arabs of Iraq" in SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA No. 5 of 1958 A. Pershits said that the new Iraqi Republican Government was tackling "fundamental problems". The new provisional Constitution had proclaimed the equality of all citizens; the tribal courts had been abolished - an "anti-feudal" measure; unoccupied State lands were to be distributed to landless peasants; measures were being put in hand for the liquidation of unemployment and the raising of living standards; a heavy industry was to be established; the foreign oil companies were to be obliged to increase the output of oil, in order to increase the State's income; and close and fruitful cooperation with the United Arab Republic was being established, which was "of great importance for the successful progress of the young Republic in its new path". Earlier Soviet accounts of the demands of the Iraqi working masses had included some of the above. But they had also included such demands as universal suffrage and "the holding of free and fair elections"; the emancipation of women; nationalization of the oil industry; and reduction in the size of the armed forces.

Soviet writers had previously given little consideration to the role of the army in Iraqi politics. One writer indeed spoke of insubordination by "a considerable part" of the Iraqi forces at the time of the

Suez intervention; but the army was usually only mentioned in the context of the country's "militarization" or the suppression of popular risings. Describing the revolution of 14th July, however, a Soviet writer says that "patriotic elements of the Iraqi army joined the movement of the whole people, forming the principal shock forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle". Such observations exemplify the uniform approval which the new regime is accorded in Soviet writings; one cannot as yet find in them any more considered analysis of Iraqi aims. For the immediate aims of Soviet publicists the course of events in Iraq exhibits a close enough correspondence with the Soviet ideal, even if a more critical examination would reveal certain discrepancies.

SOVIET EYES ON THE GULF STATES

In October 1958 SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK (Contemporary East) published an article by A. Leonidov, entitled "The Atlantic Oligarchy and the Persian Gulf", which described the oil wealth of the Persian Gulf and its importance for Britain and America - not indeed for their workers, but for the "oligarchy" of big business interests. It was this, said Leonidov, which explained recent Anglo-US joint action in the Eastern Mediterranean; Beirut and Amman, no less than Ankara and Tehran, were "fortresses guarding the routes to the bottomless treasure-house of the Persian Gulf". This picture of Britain and the USA supporting each other in the Persian Gulf directly contradicts the more usual Soviet version, according to which the two countries are bitter rivals for oil and political influence in the region. But in another respect also Leonidov's article represents an advance in Soviet writing on this topic.

A Tradition of Working-Class Struggle In a central part of this article Leonidov traces back to the early Middle Ages the history of popular revolution in the Arab countries of the Gulf. Harun ar-Rashid and his successors, he says, had to deal with periodical revolts in these parts; he cites the successful ninth century rising of the Zanj slaves imported from East Africa, and the foundation by the communistically-minded Carmathians, after an equally

successful rising in Bahrain, of an independent state which eventually "conquered almost the whole of Arabia". (An article in the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia, 1953, took a less favourable view of the Carmathians: the Carmathian state, it said, owed its existence to "the exploitation of tens of thousands of state slaves". - Ed.) Leonidov's article goes on:

> "In our time the class struggle in Arabia has lost its medieval crust; the popular movements in the emirates of the Persian Gulf have joined the general irresistible current of the Arab national revolution. We are not now surprised to learn that in its stubborn and heroic fight for freedom and independence Oman does not yield to the British imperialists; that Kuwait welcomes the Iraqi revolution and the declaration of Algerian independence; that in Saudi Arabia, where not long ago there was still not even one proletarian, a workers' movement is now developing; the Arab workers with the support of the broad masses of the people are defending their rights in stormy class struggles with the American monopolists. We are also not surprised that the countries of the Persian Gulf are now represented in international trade union congresses and in international democratic organizations. We know that, having ended their centuries-old isolation, the countries of the Persian Gulf have joined the struggle for Arab unity; that in these countries the forces of democracy are growing; and that, for the first time in their history, modern democratic organizations are being formed here, and Arab national consciousness is maturing."

Leonidov, in fact, seems to present a more uncompromising picture of mass struggle in the Gulf States than can be found in previous Soviet writings; and his excursion into Arab history is an interesting attempt to discover an indigenous tradition of working-class revolt in this region. At the same time his sympathy with pan-Arab and working class aspirations in the Gulf States does not lead him to express disapproval of the rulers of these states. Has the same reserve been shown by other Soviet writers in this field?

Attitude to Rulers Soviet works of reference call Kuwait "virtually a colony" of Britain; the British Political Agent is "virtually the ruler of the country". One speaks

392370

of the "uncontrolled despotism" of the Shaykh, and says that oil profits are distributed among members of his family. Similar statements are made about Bahrain; the Shaykh is "formally the head" of the state, "and all responsible posts in the Government are held by his numerous kinsmen", but in reality "almost all power is in the hands of the British Political Agent, who is official adviser of the Shaykh and head of the Bahrain gendarmerie and police". Qatar is similarly described as "virtually ruled by the British Resident".

Nevertheless, it appears that these rulers are not in all cases regarded as irrevocably committed to opposition to their peoples' aspirations. The Shaykh of Kuwait, for example, is said to have responded to his people's demands in 1953 to the extent of rejecting a British plan for federation of the Gulf States, and supporting a proposal to finance the development of Arab League member states out of Kuwait oil profits. Again, a Soviet writer recalls that at the time of the Suez intervention the Shaykh, once more responding to his people's feelings, gave £250,000 to help Egypt; and that he refused to cede to Iraq a Kuwaiti island in the Persian Gulf which Nuri as-Sa'id's Government wanted in order to facilitate the shipping of oil from Basrah, after "Syrian patriots" had cut Iraq's pipelines to the Mediterranean. (Note: In reality, no such "Kuwaiti island" existed; the proposal was for the construction of an oil terminal in Kuwaiti waters.)

An article in NEW TIMES No.43 of October 1958 speculated on the course which the Shaykh would adopt in the new situation following the revolution in Iraq: would Kuwait now join the Arab League and "cooperate with the Arab States that head the national liberation movement", or would it favour the latest British plan for a federation of Gulf States in military and economic association with the Baghdad Pact? The Shaykh, the writer of the article concluded, was firmly opposed to the latter project, but had yielded to British pressure and cancelled his decision to join the Arab League.

It is in fact not so much the rulers as their relations with Britain which evoke Soviet criticism; and this is true of the treaties signed between these States and Britain. The 1861 treaty between Britain and Bahrain is described as "inequitable" and "oppressive". In an agreement concluded with Turkey in 1913, one writer claims, Britain "solemnly promised" not to set up a protectorate over Kuwait, but this did not prevent her establishing a de facto protectorate over Kuwait after the First World War.

But, however oppressive they regard the treaties "imposed on" the Gulf States by Britain, Soviet writers can on occasion show scant respect for the national integrity and raison d'être of these States themselves. Their existence as separate states, it is suggested, is solely due to British policy. In THE ARAB COUNTRIES AND COLONIALISM (1956) E. Primakov relates how in the second half of the nineteenth century Wahabism was striving to unite the Arab tribes, but was violently resisted by Britain, which opposed "the progressive process of liquidating the parcelling out of Arab emirates and forming strong centralized self-governing states". It was Britain's policy, the writer says, "to kindle separatist trends" in the peninsula.

The Oil Companies The Gulf States' British (and also American) connections are condemned in Soviet writings because of their strategic implications - Bahrain, for example, is represented as an important British naval and US air base, Kuwait as a British submarine base, and Qatar as a US naval base. But it is British and US control of these countries' oil resources that is particularly denounced. On this subject, Soviet authors regularly contrast the profits of the oil companies with the earnings of their local employees. There are occasional references to popular demand for revision of the oil companies' concession agreement. It is stated that in Bahrain, "following the growth of the anti-imperialist struggle", the US concessionaries were compelled to increase the local administration's share of the oil profits, and that in Kuwait in 1951, "under the influence of events connected with the nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in Iran", the Kuwait Oil Company was obliged to increase to 50 per cent the share of profits paid to the Shaykh of Kuwait. At the same time it is pointed out that the increased sums accruing were not devoted to the needs of the peoples of Bahrain and Kuwait, bu, were frozen in British banks; one of the demands of the people's movement in Bahrain, it is stated, was the transfer of BAPCO's payments from British banks to one of the Arab countries' banks.

The oil workers of Kuwait, says one writer, are "ruthlessly exploited" by the oil companies; most of them are miserably paid; because of the housing shortage an oil worker who receives five rupees a day has to pay three and a half rupees for a room; there are often several families

in one room. In Bahrain the American and British staff live in comfortable villas, while the Arab and Indian workers live in "filthy hutted camps". An Arab employee receives only a fraction of the pay of an American or British employee. In Kuwait, says one writer, the Shaykh was recently compelled by public opinion to allocate part of the income from oil profits to social welfare projects; water supply and education measures were indeed taken in hand, "but for the improvement of the material welfare of the people little is still being done, seeing that neither the governing circles of Kuwait nor the oil magnates are interested in this".

In addition to the above, some more particular accusations are made concerning the treatment of oil workers in Kuwait. ("To this day", says a work published in 1958, "the workers of Kuwait are deprived of the right of having their own trade unions.") It is alleged that the Kuwait Oil Company "follows a policy of dividing workers according to religious, national and racial groupings, to prevent their uniting together", and "provokes national and religious hatred"; there have been not a few cases of workers being beaten up. One of the demands made by strikers in Kuwait in 1948 was said to be "the ending of corporal punishment".

Political Movements A Soviet account of popular and working-class movements in Kuwait begins with the formation, in the 1930s, of the "Young Kuwaiti" movement, and its subsequent suppression; it goes on to chronicle the post-war "general working-class struggle for political freedom, national independence and better living conditions", and oil workers' strikes in 1948, 1950 and 1952; and it recalls the participation of a Kuwaiti delegate in the Third World Congress of Trade Unions in 1953, the formation of a Kuwaiti peace partisans' committee in 1954, and the formation in the same year of the Democratic League, "which began a national campaign for the utilization of oil profits in the interests of the Kuwaiti people".

A similar account is given of events in Bahrain after the Second World War, when "all the patriotic forces of the country rallied round the bourgeois nationalist intelligentsia" their "struggle against British imperialism" was "linked with the struggle of the peoples of Iran for the nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company". The activities of the

National Union, "uniting all the patriotic forces of Bahrain", are narrated at length, and it is emphasized that the disbandment of the organization did not end the activities of its members.

Iran's Claim to Bahrain In the April 1953 issue of VOKRUG SVETA Yu. Andreasyan expressed unqualified support for Iran's claim to sovereignty over the Bahrain archipelago. Iran's claim, he said, was based on 150 years of ownership; unification of Bahrain with Iran was one of the aspirations of the people of Bahrain. However, a work on the Arab countries published in 1956, referring to Iran's claim, merely said that "the Anglo-Iranian dispute over Bahrain has not yet been settled"; and a book published in 1958, quoting a statement by the Iranian Foreign Minister on the subject, refrained from comment. Continued Soviet support for Iran's claim to Bahrain would obviously be inconsistent with recent Soviet accounts of the Bahrain nationalist movement, which give it an exclusively Arab character.

In conclusion, the general impression given by recent Soviet writings on the Gulf States is that the writers are careful that their sympathy with the "liberation struggle" should not carry their argument to any unnecessary logical extremes or commit them to a premature expression of opinion on any secondary issue. The prime issue is the relationship between these States and Britain; their internal political evolution and their destiny in the Arab world are, for Soviet writers, secondary to the main theme.

(Soviet writings on Muscat and Oman and Trucial Oman will be reviewed in a later issue of the MIZAN NEWSLETTER.)

SOVIET ANGLE ON THE NEWS

Below are reviewed recent Soviet newspaper reports on Middle East events (up to 10th January).

Reply to Western report on Afro-Asian conference Western newspapers reported that at the Afro-Asian economic conference held in Cairo in December a Soviet resolution condemning Western countries' activities in the Middle East was rejected. This, according to IZVESTIYA's correspondent Kondrashov (17.12.58), was a piece of "malicious misinformation". A Philippine delegate had deliberately "invented" the story and put it out at a press conference; but at a later press conference, challenged by Soviet correspondents, he had been obliged to admit that he had misunderstood the conference committee proceedings.

The High Dam agreement IZVESTIYA's Cairo correspondent Kondrashov said (29.12.58) that the Western press had been trying to belittle the Soviet Union's agreement with the UAR on the High Dam. West German and Italian businessmen, he said, were now claiming to have promised participation in the construction of the second stage of the dam; but he was officially informed that no such offers had been made to the Government of the UAR. In an article on 3.1.59 Kondrashov said it was being suggested that West German firms were competing with the USSR for the construction of the first stage of the dam; but this was impossible since, as AL-AHRAM had pointed out, the agreement with the USSR had "closed the door" to any such manoeuvres, whose aim was evidently political rather than economic.

The High Dam agreement was the subject of an article in PRAVDA on 9.1.59 by Nikitin, Vice-Chairman of the State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations of the USSR Council of Ministers. Nikitin described the agreement's significance for Soviet-UAR economic collaboration and for friendly relations between the two countries; the economic benefits the dam would bring to Egypt; the advantages which the UAR would derive from the training of technicians and workers under the guidance of Soviet experts; the favourable terms of the Soviet loan; the USSR's "selfless aid" to the UAR in the construction of over 100 industrial projects, and the "real joy" with which a visiting group of Soviet experts was recently welcomed in towns of the UAR; and the "indestructible

friendship" between the Soviet and Arab peoples, which was proved at the time of the Suez intervention and more recently during the US-British occupation of Lebanon and Jordan.

UAR action against Communists The UAR round-up of Communists on 31.12.58 seems not to have been mentioned in the Soviet press. (It was briefly reported in Soviet broadcasts in Arabic, only, on 2 and 3.1.49, without comment. - Ed.)

UAR-Iraqi relations An IZVESTIYA article by Kondrashov (1.1.59) accused the Cairo newspaper AKHBAR AL-YAWM of publishing in its issue of 27.12.58 "tendentious" reports, taken from British and American news agencies, about the situation in Iraq and about Iraqi-UAR relations. The Egyptian newspaper, said IZVESTIYA, had described the situation in Iraq as "critical" and "on the verge of an explosion", and had asserted that progressive forces in Iraq were against friendly relations with the UAR - all of which had been "flavoured with a pretty good dose of anti-Soviet slanders". The fact was, IZVESTIYA continued, that an attempt was now being made to create an atmosphere of suspicion between Cairo and Baghdad; another Cairo newspaper, AL-AHRAM, had acknowledged this. AKHBAR AL-YAWM had in the past been an obsequious supporter of King Farouk; evidently it had now become a lackey of dollar diplomacy.

A PRAVDA article by Borovskiy on 6.1.59 accused the US press of embarking on a "provocative propaganda campaign" in representing Iraq as in danger of becoming Communist. The US aim, said Borovskiy, was to create alarm among other Arab Governments, to sow dissension between the Arab States, and to isolate the UAR and impose their own conditions on it.

Soviet-Iraqi relations Soviet newspapers reported the visits to the USSR of the following Iraqi delegations; in November, a peace partisans' delegation, a party of Muslim dignitaries and a delegation representing Baghdad municipality; in December, a delegation of teachers led by Abd ar-Razzaq al-Wahid. On 5th January a Soviet educational delegation of five arrived in Baghdad at the invitation of the Iraqi Ministry of Education.

BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY reported the visits of two Iraqi poets to Baku in connection with the anniversary of the Azerbaijani poet Fizuli (i.e. the great Turkish poet Fuzuli.- Ed.); one was Husayn Ali Mahfuz, and the other Muhammad Salih Bahr al-Ulum. The newspaper published an interview with the latter, and an account of his poetical work and "struggle against colonialism" in Iraq.

Soviet newspapers, for instance KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA of 25.12.58, reported meetings held by Iraqi peace partisans to protest against alleged US plans to set up a "base for aggression" in Iran which would threaten Iraq.

PRAVDA quoted Iraqi newspapers' praise for the Soviet moon rocket. It quoted AL-AHALI as saying: "We respect the USSR as the standard-bearer of human progress."

The Soviet Note to Iran The Soviet Note to Iran of 31.10.58, accusing the Iranian Government of entering into an agreement with the USA which threatened the USSR and Middle East peace, was published in full in PRAVDA (see Appendix A below). On 6.12.58 PRAVDA published an article by "Observer" denouncing the US-Iranian agreement. In addition to the points made in the Soviet Note to Iran, the PRAVDA article said that Iranian ruling circles were afraid of the growing liberation movement of their own people, and were therefore anxious for the "police support" of the USA. The article also said that there were more than 3,000 US experts and advisers in Iran, most of them in the Iranian army, which was becoming increasingly controlled by foreigners, thus "threatening it with the loss of its national character". There was "no guarantee that the army will not be used by the colonialists against the interests of the Iranian people and against their lawful aspiration to be masters in their own house and to dispose as they wish of their national wealth, above all oil".

The new Sudanese Government Reporting recent developments in the Sudan, Soviet newspapers emphasized statements by Sudanese Government spokesmen affirming the Sudan's solidarity with Arab and African peoples struggling for liberation, and its support for the Bandoeng conference resolutions.

Reports from the Arab press SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA of 18.11.58 quoted the Syrian AL-JUMHUR for the report that, according to an American officer who had arrived in Beirut

from Adana, researches were being conducted in laboratories in Adana into the production of a bacteriological weapon destined for use in the Middle East.

PRAVDA of 15.11.58 quoted the Syrian AN-NUR for the report that the US military mission in Jordan had presented to the Jordanian army a large consignment of whips made of nylon. A member of the mission had pointed out that the advantage of nylon whips was that they caused more pain than the ordinary whip but left very little mark on the body of the person beaten.

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Antony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group.

M I Z A N N E W S L E T T E R

APPENDIX A

The Soviet Note to Iran of 31.10.58

The following is a translation of the Soviet Government's Note to Iran of 31.10.58 as published in PRAVDA of 1.11.58.

The Soviet Government considers it necessary to draw the attention of the Iranian Government to the new situation which the latest measures of the Iranian Government are creating in Soviet-Iranian relations. We refer to the conclusion of a new military pact between Iran and the USA, which will provide the armed forces of the USA with broad opportunities for still further subjugating Iran to American military plans. As is known, talks on these questions between the USA and Iran were conducted, in particular, during the recent visit to Tehran of the American Secretary of Defence MacElroy.

By extending still further its military cooperation with the USA the Iranian Government directly promotes the aggressive plans of certain foreign circles against the USSR and other peace-loving states. The conclusion of this military treaty will lead Iran to even greater military and political dependence on the USA, and will inevitably increase the danger of Iran's being drawn into the military adventures of those foreign circles which have for a long time regarded the Middle East as a potential military springboard in their aggressive plans. As we know, they are attempting to justify the new dangerous step on the part of the Iranian Government by references to the needs of Iran's defence. However, these references deceive no one, since no danger threatens Iran from the direction of her neighbours, and particularly not from the Soviet Union which has invariably maintained a policy of good-neighbourliness and friendship towards Iran. To this it must be added that attempts on the part of anyone in Iran to seek safety under the collapsing roof of the Baghdad Pact and under the doubtful protection of foreign powers thousands

of kilometres from Iran will least of all fulfil their purpose, as the experience of the recent allies of Iran in the Baghdad Pact shows.

Obviously such a course of action on the part of the Iranian Government cannot help but worsen the situation in the Middle East; it is incompatible with peace and security in the Middle East.

These actions on the part of the Iranian Government are not in accord with the declarations by Persian politicians of their desire to develop and improve relations between our two countries. They also directly contradict the principle of good-neighbourly relations and Iran's obligations under the existing Soviet-Iranian treaties, in particular the treaty on security and neutrality of 1st October 1927, Article Three of which clearly says that "each of the contracting parties is bound not to participate either practically or formally in alliances or agreements directed against the security on land or sea of the other contracting party".

A curious situation is developing. On the one hand official representatives of the Iranian Government assure the Soviet Union that they are striving to develop good-neighbourly relations with the Soviet Union and will not allow Iran to be used by other powers against the Soviet Union. On the other hand the Iranian Government hastens to link itself with the USA by a military agreement of a character plainly unfriendly, and more than that, directly hostile to the Soviet Union. It may be asked, how must such a course of action be regarded? It cannot be regarded otherwise than as a proof that the Iranian Government is embarking on a course of foreign policy dangerous first of all to Iran herself, while evidently thinking little of its possible consequences.

Anxious to consolidate peace and security in the Middle East and in the whole world, the Soviet Union did not remain indifferent when during the last few years a situation developed in the Middle East fraught with military conflicts which could seriously prejudice peace in this region and the security of the USSR. The Soviet Union will remain even less indifferent when faced with the situation now developing through Iran's conclusion of a new military treaty with the USA, which exposes the southern frontiers of the Soviet Union to immediate danger.

Under these circumstances the necessity arises for the Soviet Union to reappraise the present state of Soviet-Iranian relations. In the opinion of the Soviet Government it would hardly be appropriate, for example, for the President of the Praesidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, K.E. Voroshilov, to visit Iran - a project which has recently been discussed in connection with an invitation from the Iranian side, and which was to have been a visit of good will and friendship. Since the Iranian Government is at present taking steps directed against the interests of the Soviet Union, such a visit would present a false view of the state of present Soviet-Iranian relations. From what has been said it is evident that at present such a visit would not be of use to Soviet-Iranian relations.

The Soviet Government sincerely hopes that the Government of Iran will seriously consider the situation which is developing in the relations between our two countries owing to the recent measures on the Iranian side, and will take no steps which will seriously and dangerously complicate these relations.

In turning the attention of the Iranian Government to all these circumstances the Soviet Government is guided solely by the desire to avert a course of events which might undermine peace in the Middle East and raise the question of the future fate of Soviet-Iranian relations, for the improvement of which not a little has been done during recent years.

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Antony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group.

M I Z A N N E W S L E T T E R

APPENDIX B

Soviet Books and Articles on Middle East Topics

This list is intended to give an idea of the volume and scope of recent Soviet writing on the Middle East. The following abbreviations are used for periodicals:

INT.AFF. - INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
MIR.EK. I MEZH.OTN. - MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA
N.T. - NEW TIMES
NOV. I NOV.IST. - NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA
PART.ZHIZN' KAZ. - PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN' KAZAKHSTANA
SOV.ET. - SOVETSKAYA ETNOGRAFIYA
SOV.VOST. - SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE
SOVREM.VOST. - SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK
ZV.VOST. - ZVEZDA VOSTOKA

Books Published in 1958

Ahmad Karuma	THE ARABS IN ARMS IN THE FIGHT FOR PORT SAID (149pp.) (Translated from Arabic)
Basistov, Yu. and Yanovskiy, I.	COUNTRIES OF THE MIDDLE EAST (314pp.) (A general account; published in Tashkent)
Kiselev, V.I.	THE SUDAN'S ROAD TO INDEPENDENCE (182pp.)
Kotlov, L.N.	THE NATIONAL LIBERATION RISING OF 1920 IN IRAQ (212pp.)
Ivanov, K. and Sheynis, Z.	THE STATE OF ISRAEL: ITS POSITION AND POLICY (148pp.)
Ed. Livshits, Ya.L.	FROM BANDOENG TO CAIRO (79pp.) (on the Afro-Asian solidarity conference held in Cairo in December 1958)

Various Authors		THE LAST COLONIES OF ASIA (178pp.) (includes a chapter on Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, the Trucial States, Oman and Aden)
"	"	CONTEMPORARY SYRIA (325pp.)
"	"	CONTEMPORARY TURKEY (290pp.)
"	"	AN ETHNOGRAPHIC SYMPOSIUM OF THE MIDDLE EAST, Vol.I (336pp.)

Articles Published July - December 1958

INT.AFF.	No.7	Lebanon: A Conspiracy against the People
		Bahrain (on Bahrain's "fight for national independence")
		Baghdad Pact: The Second Edition
		Turkey: Pan-Turk Ravings
	No.8	Iraq: Victory of the People
	No.9	The Oil Monopolies, Instigators of Aggression
		Iraq: On the Road to Progress
		Lebanon: Under the Heel of American Occupation
		Jordan: An Occupied Country
		Kuwait (on Kuwaiti reactions to events in Iraq)
		Turkey: Why has the USA Granted a Loan?
MIR.EK. I MEZH.OTN.	No.10	Imperialist Blocs and the Finances of Turkey
N.T.	No.27	The Military Situation in Lebanon
	No.29	Iraq (on the July coup d'etat)
	No.30	New Version of Suez (on the landings in Lebanon and Jordan)
		Fall of the Middle Eastern Bastille (on Iraq)
		Why the Arabs Hate Them (on Lebanon and Jordan)
		Unruly Ruler(on the British refusal to recognize the Sultan of Lahaj)
		Arab States (on Jordan, Qatar and Kuwait)
	No.31	Arab States (on Saudi Arabia and the Yemen)
	No.32	The Baghdad Pact without Baghdad

N.T.	No.33	Murphy in Israel Arab States (on Bahrain and Aden)
	No.36	The Jordanian Scene Last Bid (on events in Southern Arabia) Fighting Locusts in Persia
	No.38	Two Camps in the Lebanon
	No.39	Who is Charles Malik?
	No.40	Showing Them the Door (on the Lebanese Government)
	No.41	Washington's Trojan Horse (on Lebanon)
	No.42	Mystification (on "religious incitement" in Lebanon)
	No.43	The Kuwait Millions (on why Kuwait decided not to join the Arab League)
	No.44	The Aswan Problem The Deuce of Trumps (on arming of Israel by the West)
	No.45	Iran: Dangerous Move (on preparations for a US-Iranian military alliance) Net Loss (on the withdrawal of troops from Jordan and Lebanon)
	No.46	The Real Issue (on preparations for a US-Iranian military pact)
	No.47	Patching up the Baghdad Pact Neglected Tradition (on the history of Soviet-Turkish Relations) Iraq's Plans and Problems
	No.50	Sentinel of the Oil Monopolies (on the construction of military bases in Iran) Petrol Pump Politics (on how the projected military alliance between Iran and the USA will benefit the oil monopolies
NOV. I NOV.IST.	No.3	The Part Played by the US Oil Monopolies in the Anglo-Iranian Conflict of 1951-1954
	No.6	The Imperialist Policy of the Entente in Turkey's Arab Possessions 1914-1918
PART.ZHIZN' KAZ.	No.8	Soviet Kazakhstan - The Beacon of a New Life (a comparison with the Sudan)
SOV.ET.	No.5	The Arabs of Iraq Exhibition of Syrian Art in Leningrad and Moscow
SOV.VOST	No.4	Cities of Iran in the Early Middle Ages
	No.5	Israel and American Imperialism Iranian Emigrant Workers in Turkestan after the Victory of the October Revolution (1918-1921)

SOVREM.VOST.	No.7	US Monopolies in the Lebanon
		In the Towns of the UAR
		A New Stage in the Struggle for Iranian Oil
	No.8	In the Towns of the UAR (concluded)
		The Birth of a Republic (Iraq)
		The Sudan at the Beginning of a New Path
		The Everyday Life of the Arabs of Saudi Arabia
		How the Turkish Workers Live
	No.9	Whole issue devoted to the conference of Asian and African writers held in Tashkent in October 1958
	No.10	The Atlantic Oligarchy and the Persian Gulf
		The Sudan at the Beginning of a New Path (continued)
		Joy, Anger and Faith of a People (on how the Egyptians received the news of the Iraqi revolution)
		Revolution in Iraq
		Notes of an Eye-Witness (on American landings in Lebanon)
		Why They Hate Them (dialogue between a "Lebanese patriot" and an American soldier)
		At the Consortium's Oilfields
	No.11	Dark Days for Jordan
		The Sudan at the Beginning of a New Path (concluded)
		Agrarian Reforms in Iraq
	No.12	Iraq on a New Path
		The Damascus Fair
ZV.VOST.	No.10	Russian Travellers on the Banks of the Nile (on Russian travellers' visits to Egypt since the sixteenth century)

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Antony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group.